

Message Text

PAGE 01 STATE 190607

44

ORIGIN SS-10

INFO OCT-01 ISO-00 SSO-00 CCO-00 /011 R

66604

DRAFTED BY S/S-O:CNAGAO

9/25/73 EXT. 21512

APPROVED BY S/S-O:PSARROS

----- 059570

O 251927Z SEP 73 ZFF4

FM SECSTATE WASHDC

TO USMISSION USUN NEW YORK IMMEDIATE

S E C R E T STATE 190607

EXDIS

TOSEC 50

FOLLOWING SENT SECSTATE WASHDC INFO DOD WASHDC MOSCOW
NATO FROM USDEL SALT TWO 25 SEP 73:

QUOTE S E C R E T SALT TWO GENEVA 5095

EXDIS/SALT

SPECAT EXCLUSIVE FOR SECDEF

E.O. 11652: XGDSI

TAGS: PARM

SUBJ: AMBASSADOR JOHNSON'S STATEMENT OF SEPTEMBER 25, 1973

(SALT TWO -- 278)

THE FOLLOWING IS STATEMENT DELIVERED BY AMBASSADOR JOHNSON
AT THE SALT TWO MEETING OF SEPTEMBER 25, 1973.

MR. MINISTER:

TODAY, AS YOU NOTED, WE RESUME THE SALT TWO NEGOTIATIONS AND
CONTINUE WORKING TOWARD OUR GOAL, WHICH IS TO REACH A MUTUALLY
SECRET

PAGE 02 STATE 190607

SATISFACTORY PERMANENT AGREEMENT LIMITING STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS
TO REPLACE THE INTERIM AGREEMENT.

AS YOU VERY WELL NOTED, SINCE WE LAST MET, THE HIGHEST AUTHOR-

ITIES OF OUR TWO COUNTRIES HAVE HELD A SERIES OF DISCUSSIONS IN WASHINGTON WHICH ARE MOST RELEVANT TO OUR WORK HERE AND SHOULD EXPEDITE THESE NEGOTIATIONS. PRESIDENT NIXON AND GENERAL SECRETARY BREZHNEV HAVE AGREED THAT OVER THE COURSE OF THE NEXT YEAR SERIOUS EFFORTS WILL BE MADE TO WORK OUT THE PROVISIONS OF THE PERMANENT AGREEMENT ON MORE COMPLETE MEASURES ON THE LIMITATION OF STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS WITH THE OBJECTIVE OF SIGNING IT IN 1974. MEETING THIS GOAL WILL REQUIRE A MAXIMUM EFFORT ON THE PART OF OUR DELEGATIONS. IF EACH SIDE TAKES FULLY INTO ACCOUNT THE EQUAL SECURITY INTERESTS OF THE OTHER IN OUR EFFORT TO MAINTAIN AND ENHANCE THE STABILITY OF THE US-SOVIET STRATEGIC RELATIONSHIP, WE ARE CONFIDENT THIS GOAL CAN BE ACHIEVED.

II

TODAY'S MEETING IS AN APPROPRIATE OCCASION TO REVIEW WHERE WE STAND IN THIS SEARCH FOR AN EFFECTIVE AND MUTUALLY ACCEPTABLE PERMANENT AGREEMENT LIMITING STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS. AT THE LAST SESSION, AS AN ALTERNATIVE TO ITS MARCH 13 PROPOSAL, THE U.S. SUBMITTED ANOTHER SPECIFIC AND BALANCED PROPOSAL FOR THE LIMITATION OF STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE WEAPONS. WE STATED THAT THE U.S. IS PREPARED TO ACCEPT AN AGGREGATE CEILING FOR EACH SIDE OF 2350 ICBM AND SLBM LAUNCHERS AND HEAVY BOMBERS. A CEILING OF 2350 REPRESENTS A REALISTIC LEVEL TO WHICH EACH SIDE CAN ADAPT WITHOUT SIGNIFICANT CHANGE IN ITS CURRENT DEPLOYMENT. WITHIN THIS AGGREGATE CEILING, SUBSTITUTION OF SLBM LAUNCHERS AND HEAVY BOMBERS FOR ICBM LAUNCHERS, AND FOR EACH OTHER, WOULD BE PERMITTED. A CEILING ON THE AGGREGATE ICBM THROW-WEIGHT WOULD BE A DEFINITE AND CLEAR WAY OF LIMITING THE LONG TERM POTENTIAL OF THE ICBM FORCES OF THE TWO SIDES. WE ARE ALSO PREPARED TO CONSIDER A PROGRAM FOR ACHIEVING SUBSEQUENT REDUCTIONS IN THE CEILINGS ON CENTRAL STRATEGIC FORCES.

IN THE CONTEXT OF AGREEMENT ON THE FOREGOING, THE U.S. WOULD BE PREPARED TO CONSIDER IN A PERMANENT AGREEMENT RECIPROCAL ASSURANCES TO THE EFFECT THAT NEITHER SIDE WOULD CIRCUMVENT THE AGREEMENT THROUGH THE DEPLOYMENT OF NON-CENTRAL
SECRET

PAGE 03 STATE 190607

SYSTEMS. SUCH ASSURANCES WOULD MEET THE LEGITIMATE INTERESTS OF BOTH SIDES THAT A PERMANENT AGREEMENT WOULD NOT BE CIRCUMVENTED THROUGH THE DEPLOYMENT OF SYSTEMS NOT LIMITED BY THE AGREEMENT AND WOULD BE CONSISTENT WITH THE BASIC PRINCIPLES AGREED TO IN WASHINGTON IN JUNE.

THE UNITED STATES HAS PROPOSED A PROVISIONAL AGREEMENT WHICH WOULD PROHIBIT THE DEVELOPMENT, FLIGHT TESTING, PRODUCTION AND DEPLOYMENT OF NEW OR MODIFIED MULTIPLE REENTRY VEHICLE SYSTEMS FOR ICBMS. NEW OR MODIFIED MULTIPLE REENTRY VEHICLE SYSTEMS WOULD BE DEFINED AS THOSE SYSTEMS WHICH HAD NOT BEEN FLIGHT TESTED AS OF JANUARY 1, 1973. DEPLOYMENT OF OTHER MULTIPLE REENTRY VEHICLE SYSTEMS FOR ICBMS WOULD BE LIMITED

TO THE NUMBER OF LAUNCHERS FOR SUCH SYSTEMS WHICH ARE OPERATIONAL OR WHICH ARE UNDER CONSTRUCTION OR CONVERSION FOR SUCH SYSTEMS AS OF AN AGREED DATE. WE HAVE STATED THAT IN THE EVENT THE PERMANENT AGREEMENT INCORPORATES LIMITATIONS ON MULTIPLE REENTRY VEHICLE SYSTEMS AT LEAST AS ADEQUATE AS THOSE WE HAVE PROPOSED FOR THE PROVISIONAL AGREEMENT, IT SHOULD BE POSSIBLE TO ACHIEVE ESSENTIAL EQUIVALENCE WITHOUT THE NECESSITY FOR PRECISE EQUALITY IN THE NUMBER OF ICBM LAUNCHERS AND THE THROW-WEIGHT OF THE MISSILES WHICH COULD BE LAUNCHED FROM THOSE LAUNCHERS.

III

THE U.S. HAS DEVELOPED AND DEPLOYED ITS STRATEGIC ARMS FOR THE PURPOSE OF PREVENTING NUCLEAR WAR THROUGH DETERRENCE. NEAR THE BEGINNING OF THE FIRST PHASE OF THESE TALKS, AMBASSADOR SMITH ELABORATED THE PURPOSE OF DEPLOYING THESE WEAPONS. HE STATED :

"...HAS BEEN TO MAKE IT TOTALLY UNPRODUCTIVE FOR ANY COUNTRY TO INITIATE HOSTILITIES AGAINST THE UNITED STATES AND ITS ALLIES. WHILE THE U.S. PROPOSES TO CONTINUE TO MAINTAIN A SUFFICIENT NUCLEAR DETERRENT POSTURE FOR AS LONG AS IT MAY BE REQUIRED, AND RECOGNIZE THAT THE SOVIET UNION MAY HAVE SIMILAR ATTITUDES ON SUCH MATTERS, WE THINK THE PRESENT RELATIONSHIP TO BE SUSCEPTIBLE TO IMPROVEMENT, TO THE BENEFIT OF BOTH SIDES, AND TO THE DETRIMENT OF NEITHER." THESE GOALS WERE REAFFIRMED DURING OUR LAST SESSION IN GENEVA AND CONTINUE TO PROVIDE THE BASIS FOR OUR APPROACH TO THESE NEGOTIATIONS.

SECRET

PAGE 04 STATE 190607

WE ARE CONVINCED, AS WE ARE SURE YOU ARE, THAT ONE OF THE MOST IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTIONS OUR TWO COUNTRIES CAN MAKE TOWARD IMPROVING THE PRESENT RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN OUR COUNTRIES IS TO COMPLETE THE TASK UNDERTAKEN HERE IN GENEVA IN THE SPIRIT OF THE "BASIC PRINCIPLES OF RELATIONS BETWEEN THE U.S. AND THE U.S.S.R." OF MAY 29, 1972, AND THE "BASIC PRINCIPLES OF NEGOTIATIONS ON THE FURTHER LIMITATION OF STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE ARMS" OF JUNE 21, 1973. THESE PRINCIPLES EXPLICITLY SET FORTH THE IMPORTANCE OF THE RECOGNITION OF EACH OTHER'S EQUAL SECURITY INTERESTS AND THE OBLIGATION NOT TO SEEK UNILATERAL ADVANTAGE, DIRECTLY OR INDIRECTLY. THE clearest implication OF THESE PRINCIPLES IS THAT AN AGREEMENT ON STRATEGIC OFFENSIVE SYSTEMS MUST PROVIDE FOR ESSENTIAL EQUIVALENCE IN THE CENTRAL SYSTEMS OF BOTH SIDES.

WE BELIEVE THE PROPOSALS SET FORTH BY THE U.S. REPRESENT A SOUND AND REALISTIC BASIS FOR AGREEMENTS WHICH DO PROVIDE FOR ESSENTIAL EQUIVALENCE. WE LOOK FORWARD TO YOUR EARLY RESPONSE TO THESE PROPOSALS. JOHNSON UNQUOTE RUSH

SECRET

<< END OF DOCUMENT >>

Message Attributes

Automatic Decaptioning: Z
Capture Date: 10 MAY 1999
Channel Indicators: n/a
Current Classification: UNCLASSIFIED
Concepts: DOCUMENTS, TEXT, NEGOTIATIONS
Control Number: n/a
Copy: SINGLE
Draft Date: 25 SEP 1973
Decaption Date: 28 MAY 2004
Decaption Note: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Action: RELEASED
Disposition Approved on Date:
Disposition Authority: collinp0
Disposition Case Number: n/a
Disposition Comment: 25 YEAR REVIEW
Disposition Date: 28 MAY 2004
Disposition Event:
Disposition History: n/a
Disposition Reason:
Disposition Remarks:
Document Number: 1973STATE190607
Document Source: ADS
Document Unique ID: 00
Drafter: S/S-O:CNAGAO
Enclosure: n/a
Executive Order: 11652 XGDSI
Errors: n/a
Film Number: P750014-0245
From: STATE
Handling Restrictions: n/a
Image Path:
ISecure: 1
Legacy Key: link1973/newtext/t19730963/abqceisd.tel
Line Count: 162
Locator: TEXT ON-LINE, TEXT ON MICROFILM
Office: ORIGIN SS
Original Classification: SECRET
Original Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Original Previous Classification: n/a
Original Previous Handling Restrictions: n/a
Page Count: 3
Previous Channel Indicators:
Previous Classification: SECRET
Previous Handling Restrictions: EXDIS
Reference: n/a
Review Action: RELEASED, APPROVED
Review Authority: collinp0
Review Comment: n/a
Review Content Flags:
Review Date: 17 OCT 2001
Review Event:
Review Exemptions: n/a
Review History: RELEASED <17-Oct-2001 by thigpegh>; APPROVED <04 MAR 2002 by collinp0>
Review Markings:

Declassified/Released
US Department of State
EO Systematic Review
30 JUN 2005

Review Media Identifier:
Review Referrals: n/a
Review Release Date: n/a
Review Release Event: n/a
Review Transfer Date:
Review Withdrawn Fields: n/a
Secure: OPEN
Status: NATIVE
Subject: AMBASSADOR JOHNSON'S STATEMENT OF SEPTEMBER 25, 1973 (SALT TWO -- 278)
TAGS: PARM, US, UR
To: USUN N Y
Type: TE
Markings: Declassified/Released US Department of State EO Systematic Review 30 JUN 2005